



JOINT ANTELOPE VALLEY AUTHORITY
Citizen's Committee Meeting
March 11, 2003

Meeting Began at: 9:00 a.m.

Board Members Present:	Glenn Johnson
Citizen's Committee Members Present:	Randy Stramel, Delores Lintel, Mike Morosin, Pamela Manske, Beth Thacker, James Mastera, Jim Christo,
Citizen's Committee Members Absent:	Robert Campbell
Others Present:	Bruce Sweney, Amy Cornelius, Wynn Hjermstad, Kent Seacrest, Wayne Teten, Ron Ring, Ed Patterson, Harlan Layton

Order No. 03-01 - Call Meeting to Order -
Glenn Johnson called the meeting to order. Johnson announced that Luann Finke has resigned her seat on the Citizen's Committee and that we will follow public process to find a replacement.

Order No. 03-02 - Update on RTKL - Kent Seacrest
(See attached documentation for complete descriptions of each concept.)

Kent Seacrest presented an update on the RTKL study. RTKL was directed to give "out of the box" ideas and as a result they submitted three concepts which Seacrest briefly went over. They are: Concept A - Serpentine Green, Concept B - Connected Landmarks, and Concept C - Civic Rooms. The goal of these concepts was to show 150% of the market for the next 10 years. The concepts go from conservative, Concept A, to less realistic out-of-the-box, Concept C. Seacrest anticipates using elements from each concept to formulate a final version. All the plans have costs attached to them and affect the hydrology. There are political and historical issues that need to be considered as well.

It was asked if these concepts were presented to the constituent groups and Seacrest indicated that they had not been formally presented to the three committees. He indicated that although these concepts are purposefully "out-of-the-box", the end result needs to be reality based.

The issue of parking was brought up and Seacrest stated that these concepts did not focus on parking, however it was something that will need to be considered. The City has awarded a contract to Kirkham Michael to do a downtown parking study.

It was thought that Concept A was the closest to the Environmental Impact Statement. Seacrest agreed that Concept A had the fewest changes compared to the Amended Draft Single Package.

Issues concerning how zoning would be affected from both the University and

the neighborhoods was asked. Seacrest said the zoning will be overlaid after other critical decisions are made with the plan, such with the area around the Beadle Center and the creek, etc. It was pointed out that what is important at this point is the concepts, not so much the details. Seacrest agreed that the plan needs to be decided on, but that if a redevelopment plan is to be done by the end of summer, the details need to be known as well. He anticipates that elements from each plan will be somehow integrated into the final plan.

Another issue that needs to be considered with this plan is the phasing element. Seacrest was asked to give the timing on how the Citizen's Committee is to become involved. He indicated that the timing is off by about a month and that a draft of the plan should be ready around July 2003. Hjermstad stated that staff have been looking at the differences in the concepts, the Draft Single Package and Environmental Impact Statement.

Seacrest was asked which concept, in his opinion, would bring the most financial impact and improvement in the downtown and the adjacent neighborhoods? He responded that it is really the community's plan and they are the ones who have to accept it. Then the question was asked, which one of the concepts most closely matched that which the study team had designed? Seacrest said that all three had the potential of using the study team designs. There are some elements of the concepts that need to be revisited and possibly discarded. This is why it was suggested that elements from each concept will mostly likely be incorporated into a final plan and not all elements will move onto the next step in the process.

There was discussion on the Whittier school proposals and its usage.

Seacrest finalized the discussion by stating that the three committees will filter through to the Citizen's Committee and this should become a regular agenda item for this committee.

Order No. 03-03 - Update on House Preservation and Infill Program - Kent Seacrest and Wynn Hjermstad
(See attached documentation)

The JAVA partners pledged an extra effort to wisely move some of the houses that are in the pathway of the Antelope Valley Project. The attached document is the result of coming up with a method to do this. It shows the reason why many houses are not relocated; not cost effective, mostly due to the laws that state when a house is relocated, it must meet current building and housing codes to obtain occupancy. The report shows that it costs an average of \$60,000 just to rehabilitate one house and bring it up to code.

There are 47 residential structures that have been identified in the EIS for acquisition. Some of these structures are duplexes, so there are 55 dwelling units. There are four that are definitely being relocated as they are historical structures. Three of the four are the "Triplets" located at 22nd Street and one is near Capital Parkway at 19th & 'L' Streets. There were windshield surveys done on the other structures to determine the condition and the feasibility of moving the houses. The City has limited lots available for relocation. It would be premature to identify specific structures for relocation at this point. The document presents general criteria (p.12) for structural, lot and moving guidelines. Estimated costs for moving the four historical structures are given on page 16. On average the cost is \$186,00 per unit which is more than their market value will be after the relocation. A majority of the people in the housing

industry that have been spoken to have indicated that we should not do this, that it is not cost effective. The reason for doing this is due to the pledge that the partners gave in the beginning.

The question was raised in regards to the costs of relocating a house versus the cost of buying out the property owners, while at the same time providing safe, sanitary and decent housing as dictated by the Federal Uniform Housing and Relocation Act. Hjermstad indicated that all property owners in the Antelope Valley Project acquisition area will be given the options of moving expenses and a relocation package.

Meeting adjourned at approximately 10:30 a.m.